



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,498	02/05/2001	John Michael Jensen	8025P001	9282
8791 7590 09/29/2010 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
EXAMINER				
VIG, NARESH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/29/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/776,498

Applicant(s)

JENSEN, JOHN MICHAEL

Examiner

NARESH VIG

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in reference to communication received 14 July 2010. Claims 21 – 46 are pending for examination.

Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. 1.131

The Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.131 filed 04 June 2009 to overcome the rejection of claims 21 – 46 based on John Cook newspaper article "Well-Funded Xpertsite.com Making Hay With Its Popular Answer Service" in view of archived web pages of Keen.com. On page 2 of the declaration, Applicant has stated that the invention was conceived on or about 03 February 2000, and provided exhibits 1 – 14. Applicant also stated that applicant started downloading research on the invention on 03 February 2000. Applicant states that between 23 February 2000 and 20 April 2000, applicant reviewed the downloaded information to determine how to best implement the conceived invention. Also, in declaration filed 04 June 2009, applicant recited that between 20 April 2000 and 09 August 2000, researched best manner of implementing and describing the invention, and on 09 August 2000, applicant wrote the "Patent Method" which is presented as Exhibits 10 - 11. The statement and exhibits provided by the applicant does not demonstrate that the concept of all of the limitations in the claimed invention.

- contact information of the receiver is hidden from the communication device

- identification information of the user is tracked from the text communication from the receiver.
- Transferring of fee to the receiver, or charity on behalf of the receiver
- Contact of the receiver is an account or and address
- Receiving confirmation of delivery of the text by a user

were conceived prior to 03 February 2000.

In view of the foregoing, when all of the evidence is considered, the totality of the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness fails to outweigh the evidence of obviousness.

Also, cited reference John Cook newspaper article "Well-Funded Xpertsite.com Making Hay With Its Popular Answer Service" article states that Xpertsite.com was co-founded by Ramesh Parameswaran in August. A Business Week article "Outta Here at Microsoft" dated 29 November 1999 also states that in August 1999, Ramesh Parameswaran quit Microsoft to start XpertSite.com.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that applicant's disclosure paragraph [0139-0152 and 0165] teach the claimed invention.

However, the disclosure filed by the applicant does not teach tracking of the user identification for a return text from the receiver (whose contact information is hidden) to whom said user sent a message, does not teach how the acknowledge message is delivered to the user (sender), how does the sender identify the recipient for the message

In response to applicant's argument that cited reference Rochkind in vies of Clard does not teach the claimed invention.

However, cited reference Rochkind clearly teaches capability and concept for hiding real address of their subscribers [see abstract, Fig, 2, 4 and disclosure associated with the Figure]

Applicant's other arguments and concerns are responded to in response to pending claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 21 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant's disclosure does not disclose:

contact information of the receiver is hidden from the communication device

how the identification of the user is tracked for a return text communication from the receiver. For example, how plurality users with common name like John Smith is tracked so that the return text communication from the receiver is provided to the proper user.

how is the communication via physical mail exchanged between the user and the receiver.

how is the communication exchanged between the user and the receiver when the contact information of the receiver is an account

how does the sender identify the recipient to send the message to

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 21 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As currently claimed, it is not clear:

how a user makes a selection of a receiver to receive text, is the user provided with a list of receivers?

whether the return text communication from the user is even provided to the proper user who paid the fee

during the transmission of the text from the transmission text from the communication device to the receiver through the intermediary facility, how it the text transmitted to the receiver, when the contact information of the user is not know to the communication device.

how is the communication via physical mail exchanged between the user and the receiver.

how is the communication is exchanged between the user and the receiver when the contact information of the receiver is an account

how does the sender select the recipient to send the message to. Is the recipient presented with the menu of recipients?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Business Wire article “14 Year Old Entrepreneur Launches State-Of-The-Art Free Email Forwarding Service to Internet Users” hereinafter known as MyEZmail in view of Shaw et al. US Patent 6,249,807 and Don Clark article “Keen.com Web Service to Allow Private Phone Chats”.

Regarding Claims 21, 31 and 39, as best understood by examiner, MyEZmail teaches system and method for forwarding email sent to a user's account (i.e. recipient account) to their current email address without sender's knowledge.

MyEZmail teaches capability and concept for:

Connecting communication device with an intermediary facility [MyEZmail.com]

MyEZmail does not explicitly recite sender selecting a receiver. However, MyEZmail teaches capability and concept for sender to identify a recipient to send the message to. Shaw teaches system and method for email management. Shaw teaches capability and concept for providing to sender selection capability for the sender to select recipient [Shaw, Fig. 8 and disclosure associated with the Figure]. Also, **it is old**

and known that corporate mail systems can hide the email address of the recipient by providing Global Lists, allowing user to create contact list, etc.

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify MyEZmail by adopting of shaw and allow sender to select from a list recipient to make the system and method user friendly, minimizing sender entering email address of the user every time they want to send a message to the recipient; apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

MyEZmail in view of Shaw teaches capability and concept for:

Connecting communication device with an intermediary facility [MyEZmail.com]

Selecting a receiver to receive text from a user [Shaw].

Even though MyEZmail in view of Shaw does not explicitly recite charging fee to user, however, MyEZmail teaches capability and concept for generating revenue from sponsors. Clark teaches capability and concept for recipient charging fee to senders.

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify MyEZmail in view of Shaw by adopting teachings of Clark to generate a new income source for recipient celebrities; apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the

same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art

MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept for:

transferring a fee from a user [Clark];

transmitting the text from the communication device to the receiver through the intermediary facility [MyEZmail]

wherein contact information of the receiver is hidden from the communication device [EzMail], and identification information of the user can be tracked for a return text communication from the receiver [MyEZmail].

Regarding Claims 22, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the intermediary facility can be a server.

Regarding Claims 23, 33 and 41, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the text can be transmitted as an electronic mail (e-mail) message.

Regarding Claims 24, 34 and 42, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the receiver can be a publicly known person.

Regarding Claims 25, 35 and 43, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the contact information can be an account.

Regarding Claims 26, 36 and 44, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the receiver could receive a benefit by receiving the text and the benefit could be personal benefit.

Regarding Claims 27 and 37, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the text can be transmitted on a network.

Regarding Claims 28, 38 and 45, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the communication device receives a confirmation of delivery of the text, and the confirmation of delivery can be received as an e-mail **(Receiving Acknowledge Message from the recipient is old and known email technology)**.

Regarding Claims 29 and 46, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the confirmation of delivery can be received as an e-mail.

Regarding Claims 30, 32 and 40, MyEZmail in view of Shaw and Clark teaches capability and concept wherein the fee can be paid for by a user of the communication device, and the fee can be paid to an account of the intermediary facility.

Claims 21 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rochkind US Patent 6,161,129 in view of Don Clark article “Keen.com Web Service to Allow Private Phone Chats”.

Regarding Claims 21, 31 and 39, as best understood by examiner, Rochkind teaches system and method for connecting a communication device with an intermediary facility [Rochkind, Fig.2 and disclosure associated with the Figure]. Rochkind does not explicitly recite hiding contact information of the receiver (target recipient). However, Clark teaches that to enforce privacy, Keen.com does not give contact information of the sender and receiver.

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rochkind by adopting teachings of Clark and hide the contact information of the receiver also to enforce the privacy of the users; apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art

Rochkind in view of Clark concept and capability for:

Connecting communication device with an intermediary facility [Rochkind, Clark]

Selecting a receiver to receive text from a user [Rochkind, Clark]

transferring a fee from a user [Clark];

transmitting the text from the communication device to the receiver through the intermediary facility [Rochkind]

wherein contact information of the receiver is hidden from the communication device [Clark], and identification information of the user can be tracked for a return text communication from the receiver [Rochkind, Clark].

Regarding Claims 22, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the intermediary facility can be a server.

Regarding Claims 23, 33 and 41, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the text can be transmitted as an electronic mail (e-mail) message.

Regarding Claims 24, 34 and 42, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the receiver can be a publicly known person.

Regarding Claims 25, 35 and 43, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the contact information can be an account.

Regarding Claims 26, 36 and 44, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the receiver could be receives a benefit by receiving the text and the benefit could be personal benefit.

Regarding Claims 27 and 37, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the text can be transmitted on a network.

Regarding Claims 28, 38 and 45, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the communication device receives a confirmation of delivery of the text, and the confirmation of delivery can be received as an e-mail.

Regarding Claims 29 and 46, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the confirmation of delivery can be received as an e-mail.

Regarding Claims 30, 32 and 40, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the fee can be paid for by a user of the communication device, and the fee can be paid to an account of the intermediary facility.

Claims 21 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John Cook newspaper article “Well-Funded Xpertsite.com Making Hay With Its Popular Answer Service” hereinafter known as Cook in view of previously cited archived web pages of Keen.com hereinafter known as Keen.

Regarding Claims 21, 31 and 39, as best understood by examiner, Cook teaches system and method for connecting a communication device with an intermediary facility (Xpertsite.com). Cook does not explicitly teach selecting a receiver to receive text. However, Cook teaches Keen.com as one on the competitors of Xpertsite.com. Keen teaches idea of selecting a receiver to receive text;

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cook as taught by Keen to allow the user to select a consultant of their choice, apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results.

Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept for:

transferring a fee from a user [Keen, page 12];

transmitting the text from the communication device to the receiver through the intermediary facility (Keen teaches the concept wherein the phone number, email information of the users are hidden) [Keen, page 10, 14]

wherein text is transmitted from the communication device by a user to a receiver through the intermediary facility for a fee paid by the user [Keen, page 10, 11], and the contact information of the receiver is hidden from the communication device [Keen,

page 10], and identification information of the user can be tracked for a return text communication from the receiver [Keen, page 11].

Regarding Claims 22, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the intermediary facility is a server.

Regarding Claims 23, 33 and 41, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the text is transmitted as an electronic mail (e-mail) message [Keen, page 14].

Regarding Claims 24, 34 and 42, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the receiver can be a publicly known person.

Regarding Claims 25, 35 and 43, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the contact information can be an account.

Regarding Claims 26, 36 and 44, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the receiver receives a benefit by receiving the text and the benefit is personal benefit.

Regarding Claims 27 and 37, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the text is transmitted on a network.

Regarding Claims 28, 38 and 45, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the communication device receives a confirmation of delivery of the text, and the confirmation of delivery can be received as an e-mail.

Regarding Claims 29 and 46, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the confirmation of delivery can be received as an e-mail.

Regarding Claims 30, 32 and 40, Rochkind in view of Clark teaches concept wherein the fee is paid for by a user of the communication device, and the fee is paid to an account of the intermediary facility.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 CFR '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

1. 15-Year-Old Entrepreneur Launches NO-SPAM Email Service

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NARESH VIG whose telephone number is (571)272-6810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jamisue Plucinski can be reached on (571) 272-6811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

September 26, 2010

/Naresh Vig/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629